

JUL 25 2005 9:49AM

CARDINAL HEALTH INC.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 915 P. 4

JUL 25 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re:

Applicant: Tanner et al.

Atty. Docket No.: RPS6098D1-US

Serial No.: 10/821,538

Examiner: Joseph S. Del Sole

Filing Date: April 9, 2004

Art Unit: 1722


Entitled: ENCAPSULATION MACHINE WITH VALVED INJECTION WEDGE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
MAIL STOP AMENDMENT (NO FEE)
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.6(d)

Date of Deposit: 7/25/05

I hereby certify that this Response, Terminal Disclaimer with Fee Transmittal and IDS are being sent via facsimile to the attention of Examiner Joseph S. Del Sole at (703) 872-9306 in care of Commissioner for Patents, MAIL STOP - AF-FEE, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.


Jennifer Warner

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.113

This communication is in response to a Final Office Action mailed on May 25, 2005.

Entry of the following amendment to the claims is respectfully solicited.

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2 of this Response.
Remarks/Arguments begin on page 4 of this Response.

Do Not
Enter
8/1/05

**FORM PTO-1449 TO BE FILED WITH THE
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**U.S. Department of Commerce
Patent and Trademark Office

Docket No.: RPS8129-US Serial No.: 10/821,538

Tanner et al.
Applicant**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT**April 9, 2004
Filing Date1722
Group Art UnitJoseph S. Del Sole
Examiner's Name**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

None

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

None

OTHER DOCUMENTS

1291. "The Theory and Practice of Industrial Pharmacy", Lachman, Lieberman and Kanig,
Third Edition, pp. 399-407

Examiner: Joseph S. Del Sole Date Considered: 8/1/05

Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP §609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to Applicant.

The identification of any document herein is not intended to be, and should not be understood as being an admission that each such document, in fact, constitutes "prior art" within the meaning of applicable law since, for example, a given document may have a later effective date than at first seems apparent or the document may have an effective date which can be antedated. The "prior art" status of any document is a matter to be resolved during prosecution.